

ADC:

THE PERENNIAL WHIPPING BOY

Misc

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY

urban league

means

equal opportunity

What does it do?

The Urban League **GATHERS** and **PUBLISHES** facts about conditions under which Negro citizens live and work

- **STUDIES** and **ANALYZES** these facts to find out what the problems are and **SUGGESTS** solutions
- **INTERPRETS** these facts for use by newspapers, magazines, radio and TV and by government agencies, private organizations, social scientists and others
- **MOBILIZES** the resources in the community in order to develop sound and healthy family life
- **ADVISES** Negro citizens on community resources and services that are available to help them
- **STIMULATES** self-help among Negro citizens in solving their problems
- **EVALUATES** major legislation and makes recommendations affecting the social and economic welfare of the Negro population

All Urban League programs are planned to bring about positive changes in the status of the Negro population. These programs are focused in the following areas:

1. Job Development and Employment
2. Education and Youth Incentives
3. Housing
4. Health and Welfare
5. Religious Resources

ADC: The Perennial Whipping Boy

Summary of the testimony presented by the Urban League of Essex County before the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature.

Fred Barbaro
Associate Director
Health, Welfare and Housing

The Urban League of Essex County
58 Jones Street
Newark, New Jersey, 07103

April, 1964

P R E F A C E

On October 14, 1963, Fred Barbaro, Associate Director of the Urban League of Essex County presented testimony before the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature in Newark. This Committee, chaired by Senator Anthony Grossi, (D-Passaic County) issued a hypercritical report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey.

The Urban League's concern with the Committee's findings did not stem from the fact that the report was critical. However, the criticism presented was not constructive and therefore served no useful purpose. Further, the Committee's report did not reflect a clear insight into the problems faced by the administrators of the program and the concomitant problems of the people in need of assistance.

Based upon our evaluation of the report, many of the Committee's conclusions were predicated upon dubious evidence that is not likely to withstand the scrutiny of an objective researcher. We believe that the report is unalterably biased with definite undesirable racial undertones.

In presenting his testimony, Mr. Barbaro did not attempt to answer specific charges or to apologize for the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey. He pointed out, however, that in the case of welfare, as in any program, you get what you pay for.

It was not the intention of our Agency to submit a comprehensive analysis of the total ADC Program. Instead an attempt was made to clarify some of the major issues involved and to offer suggestions designed to strengthen the program. In this connection the Urban League of Essex County is prepared to cooperate with any group that is seriously concerned with an objective appraisal of the ADC Program to the end that those in need will be adequately served.

It is primarily for the above reasons that we present herein a condensed version of the testimony before the Grossi Committee. We hope that this information will be of service to those, who like the Urban League, are interested in effectively meeting the needs of those unfortunate people in our state whose needs are beyond their resources.

Sidney Reitman
President

April, 1964

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	
1. Public Assistance and Unemployment	1
2. Extension of the ADC Program to Include Families with Unemployed Parents	2
3. The Elimination of Residence Requirements	8
4. The Practical Value of Social Work Services	9
5. Need for an In-Service Training Program for Staff	17
6. Need for A Constructive Approach	18
7. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	25
8. Notes	26
9. References Consulted	27

TABLES

I. New Jersey Statewide Summary of Unemployment	3
II. Classification of Labor Market Areas	3
III. Work Force Estimates	4
IV. Average Payments Per Recipient by Program and State	6
V. Urban and Rural Population in the United States 1930-1960	10
VI. States, According to Amount of Increase in the Population, 1950 - 1960	11
VII. Selected Data for States in the AFDC Eligibility Review, 1963	20
VIII. Percentage of Families Receiving Incorrect Payments	23

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY IS AWARE OF THE MANY DEFICIENCIES IN THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. HOWEVER INADEQUATE THIS MAY BE, IT IS THE ONLY PROGRAM THAT PREVENTS THOUSANDS OF AMERICAN FAMILIES, WHO ARE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL INSURANCE BENEFITS, FROM EXPERIENCING A COMPLETE ECONOMIC DISASTER. WE ALSO FORESEE THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR THE FUTURE AS GREATER DEMANDS ARE MADE ON THE PROGRAM DUE TO THE INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM CREATED BY AUTOMATION AND RELATED FACTORS.

I believe it will be helpful, if at the outset of this presentation we clearly define the function of public assistance in our society. The public assistance program was conceived in the belief that in this land of abundance, an American citizen must not be permitted to fall below a certain level of economic well being. It was designed to deal with only the most economically disadvantaged people. However, it was never the intention of the creators of this program nor the expectation of the legislative bodies that approved it that public assistance would solve the broad social and economic problems that cause people to need assistance. From its origin, public assistance was in theory and is in fact a remedial program. The problems of unemployment, discrimination, mental and physical illness, mental retardation and economic and cultural deprivation cannot be solved by a system of subsistent relief.

The Urban League of Essex County contends that the unemployment problem of the 1930's which necessitated the creation of a public assistance program is still, to a lesser degree, the major reason this program is needed today. Problems of desertion, illegitimacy, family breakdown and emasculation are symptoms of a greater evil. In our society a man proves his worth and gains his dignity mainly through his work. If a man is frustrated in this endeavor, for whatever reason, some form

of social pathology will inevitably arise.

We are all aware of the fact that the average national unemployment rate has been at the 6 per cent level for some time. In some of the less industrialized states the rate has been much higher. During the winter months unemployment in New Jersey has exceeded the 8 per cent level every year since 1959 and during the summer months it has exceeded the 6 per cent level. (See table I) We know that Negroes and the unskilled are hardest hit during periods of unemployment. Conditions are sufficiently severe to warrant the inclusion of certain labor market areas in New Jersey among other depressed areas in the country that now qualify for Federal economic assistance programs. (See table II) In July 1963, the unemployment rate in New Jersey was 6.3 per cent of the labor force, involving 169,350 workers. (See table III) In short, we have a serious unemployment problem in New Jersey; and as the number of unemployed persons increases, the number of people in need of public assistance will increase proportionately since many of these people are not covered by the social insurance provisions of the Social Security Act as it is now constituted.

EXTENSION OF THE ADC PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FAMILIES WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

The local public assistance agencies soon find themselves in a difficult position due to this serious unemployment problem. The local programs, commonly known as general assistance, do not receive Federal funds for their programs. Therefore, they are not able to adequately meet the increased needs of the local population. Communities faced with this problem are forced to do one of the following:

1. Request increased State aid
2. Decrease the amount of each benefit and share available funds with a larger number of families and/or

TABLE 1

NEW JERSEY STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF UNEMPLOYMENT 1959 - 1963¹

	<u>January</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>July</u>
Average Unemployment 1959-1962	217,400	196,800	165,800	173,900
Unemployment 1963	215,450	192,850	151,900	168,400
Average rate of unemployment 1959-1962	8.5%	7.7%	6.4%	6.6%
Rate of Unemployment 1963	8.2%	7.4%	5.8%	6.3%

TABLE 11

CLASSIFICATION OF LABOR MARKET AREAS AS OF AUGUST 5, 1963²

<u>Major Areas</u>	<u>Group</u>
Atlantic City	D
Camden (Sub-area of Philadelphia)	D
Jersey City	D
Newark	C
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	C
Perth Amboy-New Brunswick	C
Phillipsburg (Sub-area of Allentown, Pa.)	C
Salem (Sub-area of Wilmington)	B
Trenton	C

Smaller Areas of Substantial Unemployment

Bridgeton*
 Lakewood-Toms River*
 Long Branch*
 Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May*

*Denotes substantial and persistent unemployment

The United States Department of Labor classifies 150 major labor markets throughout the nation each month according to the nature and the extent of unemployment, using the letter designations from "A--F". Areas which are listed in groups "D", "E", or "F" (Surplus labor areas) are eligible for consideration under several Federal economic assistance programs.

Smaller labor markets with high unemployment are classified as "substantial unemployment areas" and are considered similar to the "D" through "F" classifications of major areas.

TABLE 111WORK FORCE ESTIMATES - JULY 1963³

	<u>Total non- Agricultural Wage & Salary Employment</u>	<u>Total Unemployment</u>	<u>Rate of Unemployment</u>
STATE TOTAL	2,125,200	168,350	6.3
<u>Principal Labor Markets</u>			
Atlantic City	58,000	3,800	4.6
Camden	188,400	19,800	6.7
Long Branch	90,900	7,300	5.9
Jersey City	254,100	22,400	7.4
Newark	676,500	51,900	6.2
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	390,900	30,000	6.0
Perth Amboy-New Brunswick	190,600	13,500	5.8
Trenton	111,800	6,500	4.9

3. eligibility requirements.

Since general assistance is not a part of the Federal program Federal controls over eligibility requirements do not exist. As eligibility requirements become increasingly stringent, stable families who no longer have an income become increasingly desperate. Some men leave home to seek work elsewhere, some men desert and some men pretend to desert. It soon becomes apparent to every man that the chances for them to ever gain employment again in their own communities are slim. I refer particularly to agricultural workers, miners, and employees of one industry towns. It also becomes apparent that the benefits in programs with Federal participation are higher and the eligibility requirements less stringent, than the programs supported entirely by the state and locality. Some men are forced to care for the children while their wives seek employment as domestics thereby emasculating themselves before their families and the community. Others cannot contain their frustration and desert.

Without exception benefits in the Aid to Dependent Children program are higher than benefits in the General Assistance program. (See table IV) The national average payment for families receiving general assistance in July 1960 was \$66.52 a month while the national average benefit for the Aid to Dependent Children program was \$144.18. Neither amount is sufficient to raise a family in dignity but if one were given a choice between the two figures he undoubtedly would pick the larger amount. The table also indicates that in some states the general assistance benefits averaged less than \$20.00 a month.

Soon after its inception, Federal administrators of the program realized that Aid to Dependent Children, created in the belief that it would be strengthened family life by keeping children in the home, was in practice aiding in the disruption of normal

TABLE IV

Average payment per recipient and/or per case
by program and State, (Sample), July 1960^d

State	Gen. Assistance Per Recipient	ADC ² per Family Recipient		Aid to Blind ² Per Recipient	Old Age ² Assistance Per Recipient	Aid to ² Disabled Per Recipient
Total	\$ 66.52	\$ 111.28	\$ 29.22	\$ 72.79	\$ 68.23	\$ 66.21
Ala.	12.90	38.49	9.58	39.56	53.01	36.27
Ariz.	50.14	120.66	30.24	72.07	61.40	-
Ark.	14.06	60.91	16.13	56.71	52.03	39.08
Calif.	60.43	162.38	45.64	106.62	87.94	94.28
Conn.	68.37	160.75	47.35	104.47	114.15	138.2
Del.	62.98	87.62	22.82	68.44	49.95	67.31
D.C.	74.16	150.99	33.84	68.34	64.74	74.81
Ga.	26.79	87.83	23.71	52.60	47.28	54.81
Ill.	92.57	164.56	39.28	82.07	77.87	122.90
Kans.	65.40	138.97	36.37	83.94	79.73	84.37
Ky.	37.21	86.32	24.03	51.58	50.30	53.06
La.	51.27	97.45	23.76	81.96	71.41	85.41
Md.	64.74	123.18	29.54	64.99	61.92	64.85
Mass.	62.89	150.44	44.34	111.10	97.84	120.93
Mich.	92.32	134.64	37.64	81.26	76.89	99.37
Minn.	68.50	153.79	44.63	99.30	89.08	61.39
Miss.	14.80	36.45	9.41	38.72	34.60	34.41
Mo.	52.60	87.22	22.92	65.00	60.10	62.19
Nebr.	49.62	113.38	29.84	89.23	72.47	71.05
N.J.	102.88	161.36	46.29	85.81	90.10	94.91
N. Mex.	43.48	124.58	31.66	62.47	68.09	66.34
N.Y.	90.15	168.00	42.29	115.09	107.73	103.47
N.C.	26.38	77.28	19.54	54.89	42.98	49.03
Ohio	71.90	119.15	29.90	72.52	76.03	70.88
Okla.	12.97	112.35	31.62	97.79	79.43	89.16
Pa.	72.92	124.54	31.58	74.06	68.35	60.84
R.I.	68.28	136.44	37.34	80.30	80.27	84.16
S.C.	31.83	56.89	14.29	43.60	38.92	42.88
S. Dak.	30.76	108.33	31.19	59.44	62.22	64.30
Tenn.	16.65	69.74	18.83	47.46	42.33	45.98
Utah	66.70	139.59	38.60	72.34	71.72	77.17
Va.	41.68	84.25	21.04	54.59	44.34	49.66
W. Va.	31.25	95.28	24.41	41.45	39.09	41.53
Wis.	83.27	159.74	43.45	84.82	84.39	108.06

^dExcludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments
^eIncludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments

family activities. A child requires more than economic security for normal growth; he requires both parents in the home. From this realization emerged Title I, Section 407 of the Social Security Act. This provision stipulates that the term "dependent child" shall include a needy child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of unemployment (as defined by the state) of a parent who is living with any of the relatives specified in the original act. This temporary provision has been extended until June 30, 1967. The amendment also provides for:

- a) establishing maximum use of public employment offices in the State including registration and job placement services,
- b) denying benefits if unemployed parent refuses without good cause to accept employment, in which he is able to engage,
- c) entering into cooperative arrangements with the State agency responsible for administering the vocational education program in the state with the intent of retraining individuals capable of being retrained. Benefits will be denied if unemployed parents refuse without good cause to undergo any such training.⁵

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESCSEX COUNTY, THROUGH AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, INTENDS TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN TITLE I, SECTION 407 OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT. THESE PROVISIONS EXTEND THE BENEFITS OF THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM TO FAMILIES WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS. IT ALSO PROVIDES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH STATE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE STATE WITH THE INTENT OF RETRAINING INDIVIDUALS CAPABLE OF BEING RETAINED.

We firmly believe that this act as it is now amended will strengthen the Aid to Dependent Children program and strengthen many families who find themselves in economic difficulty. There are sufficient provisions to guard against abuses if the program is properly administered.

If the father is permitted to remain in the home until he is employed or retrained for a new occupation, the family's economic situation will be greatly relieved.

THE ELIMINATION OF RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

Under the provisions of the UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT, the State of New Jersey has eliminated the residence requirement for unemployment benefits. This is a significant step in the direction of the elimination of the residence requirement for the unemployed. The residence requirement is a relic of the past, a relic of the days when the unemployed were dependent on the State for relief. The residence requirement is a relic of the days when the unemployed were dependent on the State for relief. The residence requirement is a relic of the days when the unemployed were dependent on the State for relief.

We believe that the State of New Jersey has demonstrated a keen awareness of the needs of the unemployed. The State has eliminated the residence requirement for unemployment benefits. These requirements grew out of the English Poor Law, which was designed to provide relief for the unemployed. The residence requirement was a relic of the days when the unemployed were dependent on the State for relief. The residence requirement is a relic of the days when the unemployed were dependent on the State for relief.

Americans have always migrated to greener pastures during difficult times. The migration of early settlers to the West has been replaced by the large migration to the industrialized states. As stated in the report, the movements were motivated by a search for better employment opportunities and living conditions not always available in less industrialized states. We can continue this analogy by stating that some of the new migrants are well prepared for the hazards of the wilderness, settlers for the hazards of the wilderness. On the other hand, the hazard of the wilderness did not discourage our early settlers in seeking relief from economic oppression and the hazards of urban living are unlikely to discourage our latest migrants.

A review of the migration patterns for the past thirty years points out the fact that

our urban population is growing at a much faster rate than our rural population. In 1960 63.0 per cent of the population or 113,056,353 people were living in urban centers as compared to 57.9 per cent in 1950. The population of the State has increased by 1,000,000 people between 1950 and 1960 but each state has not increased its population proportionately. It is not surprising that the ten states with the largest increases in population were also the most rapidly realized states in the period 1950-1960. Conversely, the states that experienced a slight increase in population (Mississippi lost a net of 100,000 to additional births), and the states that lost sizable numbers from their populations are the states that are experiencing economic difficulties.

Summarizing the evidence, we find that people will continue to migrate to industrial states such as New Jersey to improve their economic status and achieve economic security for their families. Some newcomers will not be prepared to cope with the new environment and may need temporary assistance to help stabilize their position as they seek employment. The fact is that people will continue to come to this state despite the inclusion of a residence requirement in the ADC program. The few who may need temporary assistance (77 in the first 9 months after the abolition of the residency requirement out of 2,527 cases in September 1962),³ will be helped by the various public assistance programs or they will not be helped at all. In addition we feel that it is inconsistent to impose state residence requirements for services financed in large part by federal funds.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICE

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY ABANDON THE PUNITIVE INVESTIGATION APPROACH IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN FAVOR OF A SOCIAL SERVICE APPROACH. WE

TABLE 1

URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1930-1960⁷

Census Date							Percentage of Total	
	Population	Increase over Preceding Census		Population	Increase over Preceding Census		Urban	Rural
		Number	%		Number	%		
1960	113,056,353	22,928,159	25.4	66,266,822	5,069,218	8.3	63.0	37.0
1950	90,128,194	15,422,816	20.6	61,197,604	3,738,373	6.5	59.6	40.4
1940	74,705,338	5,544,739	8.0	57,459,231	3,417,206	6.3	56.5	43.5
1930	69,160,599	14,907,317	27.5	54,042,025	2,273,770	4.4	56.1	43.9

TABLE VI

Rank Order of States According to Amount of
Increase in the Population Between 1950 - 1960 ⁸

Rank Order Number	State	Amount of Increase in Population
1.	California	5,130,981
2.	Florida	2,180,255
3.	New York	1,952,112
4.	Texas	1,868,483
5.	Ohio	1,759,770
6.	Michigan	1,451,428
7.	Illinois	1,368,982
8.	New Jersey	1,231,453
9.	Pennsylvania	821,354
10.	Maryland	757,688
11.	Indiana	728,274
12.	Virginia	648,269
13.	Louisiana	573,506
15.	Connecticut	527,954
16.	Wisconsin	517,202
17.	Georgia	498,538
18.	North Carolina	494,226
20.	Massachusetts	458,064
21.	Minnesota	431,381
23.	Missouri	365,160
24.	Tennessee	275,371
27.	South Carolina	265,567
29.	Alabama	204,997
33.	Delaware	128,207
37.	Kentucky	93,350
39.	Montana	83,743
40.	Idaho	78,554
41.	New Hampshire	73,679
42.	Rhode Island	67,592
43.	Maine	55,491
44.	Wyoming	39,537
45.	South Dakota	27,774
46.	North Dakota	12,810
48.	Mississippi	- 773
49.	District of Columbia	-38,222
50.	Arkansas	-123,239
51.	West Virginia	-145,131

FEEL THAT THE PUNITIVE APPROACH HAS NEVER LED TO THE REHABILITATION OF A SINGLE FAMILY NOR HAS IT DECREASED DEPENDENCY. WE BELIEVE THAT THE INTRODUCTION OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICES WILL HELP TO REHABILITATE FAMILIES WHERE THIS IS POSSIBLE AND ULTIMATELY DECREASE THE COST OF THE PROGRAM.

If it is agreed that public assistance was conceived as a method of protecting the individual from economic deprivation due to a fluctuating economic system that is beyond his control, why is the program administered in a punitive manner? How do we explain this paradox? Why are caseworkers called investigators, and where they are called caseworkers why do they spend most of their time investigating client eligibility instead of performing a normal casework function?

It is apparent that in any economy there will be a number of people who will not be able to compete equally with others for a variety of reasons many of which have been previously mentioned. They are as equally unprepared to function in the labor market as are the blind and physically disabled for which assistance is provided. However, the blind and the disabled have been rehabilitated and retrained and to a limited degree do participate both in the economic aspects and social life of our society. We feel that if the same efforts were made with individuals not plagued with physical limitations, even greater strides toward economic independence and social adjustment could be achieved. It should be acknowledged, however, that some cases are beyond the rehabilitation stage and some problems are beyond the capacity of any rehabilitative program to resolve. In any event the punitive approach to the administration of this program must be abandoned in favor of a rehabilitative approach. It must become apparent to all that some people in need of assistance may not be able to control their personal lives any more than they are able to control the economic climate of their state or locality.

If we did not know better we might be excused. It has almost become common knowledge that few rehabilitative services exist in the welfare program. The fact that the Senate committee's report stated that "no positive efforts are in effect to accomplish family stability and family rehabilitation" should be sufficient evidence to establish such a program. Demonstration projects conducted across the nation have produced dramatic results that have not only assisted families in need but have also resulted in a decrease in program costs.

In testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Winifred Bell in April, 1961, reviewed the results of ten demonstration projects in the public assistance program sponsored by the Columbia University School of Social Work. The salient points of his remarks are included in this report.

During the last decade numerous demonstration projects carried out in the public welfare agencies have provided convincing evidence that substantial savings to the taxpayer can be had if they have time to counsel actively with the troubled families seeking financial aid.

Our past efforts to save money have led us to keep assistance grants to the minimum to insist upon tight controls over eligibility and to spread the caseloads over small, untrained and poorly paid staffs. The 10 demonstration projects reviewed to date consistently show that this has been a "penny-wise, pound-foolish" approach. It is, in fact one way to guarantee that dependency will not only persist but will increase.

The conclusions set forth in this paper are not new. They have been presented in a variety of forms by their sponsors but the impression is secured that they are in, but not of, the public domain.

What do they prove? (1) It is wasteful to concentrate the efforts of public assistance agencies exclusively on the determination and verification of eligibility. This may well continue to be the focus for those families with simple, uncomplicated economic need including mothers who are needed at home to care for young children. But for those with complicating social problems we must focus our efforts on discovering the obstacles to self-help

and provide services to strengthen families if we wish to save money. (2) No investigator or social worker will have time to counsel with families unless he is responsible for only a "reasonable caseload", generally defined as ranging from 35 to 50 cases. (3) Skilled supervision and inservice training programs are essential to a constructive program in public assistance. This is particularly true in these days of acute shortage of graduate and experienced social workers. (4) Untrained investigators may have been able to verify eligibility, but effective family counseling requires the skill of trained social workers, and the more skillful the staff the more the community will save. This is tantamount to saying that we don't save money by hiring 10th graders to build missiles.¹¹

It is not our intention to imply that rehabilitation consists of merely returning parents to work. As previously mentioned, the state of the economy will be the determining factor in many cases. Public assistance cannot create jobs. On the other hand ADC mothers often wish to return to work because ADC benefits do not allow them to raise their families in dignity. They also wish to escape the "second class citizen" status inflicted on all recipients of public assistance. In cases where the mother wants to return to work she should be encouraged to do so only if adequate plans can be made for the care of the children. It is the feeling of the staff that this plan would be best for the entire family.

If a program is established with its own goal being the employment of the mother great damage may be inflicted on the family. Cook County, Illinois initiated such a program in 1960. The program was evaluated by an independent research firm that concluded the following.

The Kenwood project, in the opinion of this study's staff, is of questionable value as it is now conducted. It stresses the closing of cases through employment of the ADC mothers without adequate consideration of all the factors in the situation, as required by state policy.

Such overemphasis on closing of cases may result in some immediate savings to the department; but the way it is accomplished can be damaging to the family and can result in return to dependency for a

longer period of time more costly all around.¹²

On the other hand, the fact that the welfare department in the Marin County Welfare Department was an efficient agency for the county. Marin County Welfare Department. The efficiently administered department soon gained the support of the entire community, which recognized the fact that well administered programs would meet the needs of the people in the county and also be less expensive for each tax payer.

Mr. B. J. summarized the fact that the Marin County Welfare Department was the House Ways and Means Committee

Marin County Calif., stands out as the site of intelligent experimentation and planning for public assistance, and particularly the ANS caseload. In 1951, a new director, Betty Presley, was employed by that department. Miss Presley brought conviction that an informed community would support an effectively organized county welfare department able to provide help with difficult family problems. She foresaw that professionally trained staff and smaller caseloads prerequisite to giving skilled social services might increase administrative costs. However, she believed such services would strengthen family relationships and individual efforts, and in many instances result in self-support, thus ultimately decreasing assistance costs.

These opinions were supported by the administrative survey in June 1951 by Kroeger & Associates which said "We are firmly convinced that there is no room for the inexperienced or poorly qualified social worker on the staff of the Marin County Welfare Department." A family care unit was established to provide intensive casework, and an experimental caseload was forthwith established in this unit. Twenty-four chronic cases were assigned to a worker with graduate social work training. In the previous 5 years, \$91,920 had been spent on these families in assistance and medical care. After 1 years work, improvement was noted in all but two cases and expenditures for the entire group began decreasing. Most of these cases involved immaturity, marital conflict, mental deficiency, mental illness, and alcoholism. They included 104 children ranging from 2 to 9 in a family, and 24 of these children were known to have personality disturbances. So convincing was the improvement that the agency concluded that intensive effort in all such cases was indicated and that casework help, given in the early stages of agency contact contributed to the prevention of personal and family breakdown and economic dependence."

Between 1952 and 1956 further administrative changes were made, so that a senior clerk was trained to do much of the clerical work previously assigned to social workers, who were then free to concentrate on counseling families. Caseloads were reduced throughout the family case unit to approximately 40 to 50 cases and qualifications for workers were raised systematically. Salaries were raised, more supervision was provided, and the work of various related offices was coordinated. The results achieved in Marin County were then vigorously compared with results and trends in the San Francisco area as a whole. Marin County was found to show a significant drop in ANC cases per 1,000 of applications. Not only was the 'discontinuance rate' higher but cases stayed discontinued longer. During the 1954-56 period the costs of ANC in surrounding areas increased, although it decreased markedly in Marin County. There were also decreases in average grants per child in Marin County and studies revealed that this probably related to both increased support from absent fathers and increased earnings of parents.

The director also pointed out that based on the average monthly aid-to-needy children cases exceeds the monthly salary of one worker. Four discontinuances exceed the salary of a supervisor.

In concluding their report, Kroeger & Associates note that the program was in jeopardy in July 1955 when a firm of administrative analysis made a survey of the welfare department for the county grand jury. In the eventful public hearing, it is noteworthy that a representative of the California Tax-County were lower than in any of the other 11 counties of the State closest to Marin in population." He also pointed out that the administrative costs of Marin's total welfare program were the second lowest in this group of counties. He stated, and several other speakers agreed, that 'if you spend \$10 more in administrative costs to save \$100 in the aid program, you've saved \$90'. It was also noted that the entire program was planned and executed in a very short time. The effort given by the board and community amounted to a state of acceptance of the preventive and rehabilitative approach taken by the Marin County Welfare Department.¹³

It is quite obvious from the examples cited above that the knowledge and skill to administer an effective rehabilitation program does exist. Of course we should do noth-
the patient described in the Kenwood project described in Cook County. The number of
cases closed should not be the only criteria used to evaluate a rehabilitation program.

NEED FOR AN INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR STAFF

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY URGES THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY TO INTRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE INSERVICE TRAINING COURSE, IMPROVE WORKING CONDITIONS AND ESTABLISH A REALISTIC STATE-WIDE SALARY SCALE TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STAFF, INCREASE MORALE AND THEREBY INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAM.

The experience a new worker received during the first six months is likely to determine his attitude toward the job for the rest of his life. If the experience is poor, he may leave the position within a year, never to return. Welfare departments across the country have been plagued by a large staff turnover yet only a few states have established a procedure that brings dignity to the job. Efficiency in any business cannot be maintained when one-third of the staff leaves annually.

It is imperative that during the first six months the new staff member be given a feeling of belonging to a team that is dedicated to helping people in need. Most of the new workers will enter the welfare field with the same attitudes concerning public assistance that is generally held by the public at large. If his initial experience indicated that the welfare department is concerned only with administering a punitive program complicated by miles of red tape and clerical duties that he cannot perform, it is likely that he will only await the day a better position outside the department presents itself. Therefore, it is essential that a realistic inservice training course for new workers and a refresher course for experienced workers be established immediately. This course should include casework techniques, philosophy of the program, and material dealing with the special problems faced by ADC recipients and minority group members. The new worker must fully understand the role public assistance plays in the entire economy and not see the program as an end in itself.

It is further suggested that new workers be placed in special training units supervised by experienced workers and that at the first three to six months. During this period the supervisors should deal mainly with the employee's being on training and learning. After a training period, the supervisor should encourage worker to operate effectively and efficiently, thereby increasing his morale by providing an experience of personal accomplishment.

It is further felt that the assignment of cases by number is unrealistic as an attempt at rationalization. Early on cases may be too many if each case requires intensive work while in heavier cases may be adequate for workers who require only light supervision and direct. It is felt that the supervisor should be used according to his own ability and experience to determine how many cases he can handle and if these workers are not able to handle the cases, then the supervisor should be the crucial factor in determining how many cases he can handle. It is felt that the supervisor should be able to handle the cases and if he is not able to handle the cases, then the supervisor should be the crucial factor in determining how many cases he can handle. It is felt that the supervisor should be able to handle the cases and if he is not able to handle the cases, then the supervisor should be the crucial factor in determining how many cases he can handle.

It is further suggested that a salary scale be established. Salaries should be at least as high as other social workers in the community. It is also suggested that a salary scale should also be made to recruit graduate social workers. This would require a salary scale that compares favorably with the salaries offered by the private social work agencies in the community. It is also suggested that a salary scale should also be made to recruit graduate social workers. This would require a salary scale that compares favorably with the salaries offered by the private social work agencies in the community. It is also suggested that a salary scale should also be made to recruit graduate social workers. This would require a salary scale that compares favorably with the salaries offered by the private social work agencies in the community.

NEED FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH

THE URBAN LEADERS OF ESSEX COUNTY BELIEVES THAT IT HAS BEEN FIRMLY ESTABLISHED BY FEDERAL, STATE AND PRIVATE INVESTIGATION GROUPS THAT RECIPIENTS WHO

DELIBERATELY ATTEMPT TO PERPETUATE FRAUD IN THE ALL INDIA DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM CONSTITUTE A VERY SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE ENTIRE ALC CASELOAD. IN NEARLY THIS AMOUNTS TO 1.2%. WE UNDERSTAND THE MAIN OF NEW IERREY IS APPROPRIATE SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO ADMINISTER A SOUND REHABILITATION PROGRAM. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS APPROACH IS NOT ONLY MORALLY DESIRABLE BUT ALSO FINANCIALLY SOUND.

The reforms suggested in this presentation will require additional funds for administrative costs. The All India Dependent Children program can never be properly administered unless and until the staff who are compensated and trained are employed. For years it has been demonstrated that if a program is to be properly administered, it must have sufficient funds. It is also known that programs which provide temporary relief services will tend to increase the cost of the program. As administrative costs increase, program costs, if properly administered, decrease.

When states were rehabilitated prior to independence, it was found that increased administrative costs decreased program costs. See especially attention to Table VII. This table was constructed from a report prepared at the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The study was designed to determine the degree of fraud determined by the percentage of ineligible recipients in the ALC program in each state.

The evidence derived from this study indicates that a state that does not provide sufficient funds for the administration of the program will have a higher number of ineligible recipients in the program. On the other hand, this study also reveals other facts. The states that have the highest percentage of ineligible recipients also provide unrealistic benefits and demand unrealistic eligibility requirements. The most striking fact is that even in the states that have a relatively high percentage of ineligible

TABLE VII

Selected data for States on administration of State aid to families with dependent children, programs in relation to percent of families found ineligible in the AFDC Eligibility Review, 1963¹⁴

State	Percent of families ineligible in AFDC Eligibility Review	Average monthly cases per State, 1962	Frequency of periodic investigation of eligibility required prior to 7/1/63 $\frac{1}{2}$ (months)	Average cost of administration per case month, fiscal yr. 1962	Current income exceeds standards	Appears to have intentionally concealed or misrepresented facts	Average payment per family per month 1963
Ala.	8.4	222	12	\$4.17	6.2	2.2	\$47.39
Alaska	9.0	(2/)	12	6.60	1.9	---	121.13
Ariz.	6.8	(2/)	6	3.82	.7	1.9	120.92
Ark.	6.6	142	12	4.96	3.4	1.6	68.28
Calif.	1.2	54	12	26.72	1.1	.7	171.64
Colo.	1.9	63	6	18.93	.4	---	146.50
Conn.	11.0	67	12	18.09	4.0	4.5	176.45
Del.	10.2	(2/)	12	10.37	5.9	7.4	103.81
Fla.	9.1	131	12	6.21	4.2	3.3	62.79
Ga.	16.4	100	12	7.08	4.0	2.1	87.47
Hawaii	6.2	70	12	19.12	2.1	2.0	132.00
Idaho	1.1	91	11	11.05	---	1.2	157.82
Ill.	4.9	81	3	19.05	4.8	1.6	206.47
Ind.	2.6	68	12	12.49	2.0	.6	111.10
Iowa	1.5	66	6	13.16	.6	.2	145.52
Kans.	.8	70	6	13.31	.4	---	149.91
Ky.	12.8	124	12	5.84	5.1	2.8	94.11
La.	3.2	85	12	14.29	1.2	1.8	99.65
Maine	2.4	110	12	8.02	1.1	.5	107.36
Md.	2.6	61	6	13.99	2.6	1.8	138.45
Mass.	.8	70	3	18.19	.3	---	172.85
Mich.	5.8	105	6	9.19	3.6	3.6	139.58
Minn.	2.1	89	12	15.87	2.1	.3	178.85
Miss.	11.6	148	6	5.67	4.7	1.1	35.52
Mo.	4.5	98	6	8.00	.8	2.6	95.11
Mont.	---	71	3	14.61	---	---	134.72
Nebr.	.9	62	12	11.32	---	---	120.34
Nev.	12.4	(2/)	12	17.24	1.9	1.2	181.47
N.H.	6.2	(2/)	12	17.63	---	6.5	168.66
New York	2.0	69	12	17.24	1.9	1.2	181.47

TABLE VII - 2

State	Percent of families ineligible in AFDC Eligibility Review	Average monthly cases per worker 1962	Frequency of periodic investigation of eligibility required prior to 7/1/63 ^{1/} (months)	Average Cost of administration per case month, fiscal yr. 1962	Current income exceeds standards	Appears to have intentionally concealed or misrepresented facts.	Average payment per family per month 1963
N. Mex.	9.8	91	12	12.00	7.3	2.1	131.30
N.Y.	3.7	52	6	27.25	3.2	1.3	186.99
N.C.	3.5	104	6	7.11	3.1	1.6	96.08
N. Dak.	---	(2/)	12	16.32	---	---	164.08
Ohio	5.0	84	12	10.34	4.6	.9	121.92
Okla.	1.7	131	6	6.15	1.7	.6	124.33
Oreg.	5.4	76	12	19.26	2.7	3.5	148.57
Pa.	2.9	70	12	13.80	3.5	1.8	127.70
R. I.	3.3	72	12	15.20	.4	.8	158.63
S.C.	13.4	126	12	5.47	8.9	1.8	66.41
S. Dak.	3.1	78	6	12.07	2.1	---	121.46
Tenn.	14.3	112	12	6.34	3.3	3.8	70.72
Texas	9.6	111	12	6.78	4.7	1.8	79.15
Utah	.9	70	12	15.05	1.1	1.8	143.95
Vt.	3.1	(2/)	12	12.05	---	1.6	110.30
Va.	4.5	71	12	11.09	5.8	.8	99.71
Wash.	4.6	85	12	14.82	3.1	2.6	153.89
W. Va.	14.3	175	12	4.47	5.4	1.5	117.44
Wis.	2.9	67	12	15.33	.9	1.7	181.03
Wyo.	5.3	(2/)	6	21.33	7.2	2.6	146.35

1/ Excludes unemployed parent cases for which the Federal Government required a maximum of three months' interval between investigations

2/ Not computed; number of local-office workers carrying caseloads fewer than 25.

representative of the entire population, and the results reported to have intentionally concealed at least one important fact. In regard to the families who were found to be ineligible were not the same as the ones that we found. Many families were not adequately served, and it is the purpose of every statistician to see that many families receive very little, while many families received assistance below the correct amount. (See Table VIII)

What does this study tell us about the public assistance program across the nation and what does it tell us about public assistance in New Jersey? Briefly it tells us that state that process to obtain benefit demands relatively complex requirements and provides that only a small percentage of the population will only have a small amount of money. The report will, without doubt, knowingly misrepresent the facts to become eligible for assistance. In New Jersey this percentage is 1.2% out of an entire percentage of ineligibles of 2.0% a rather favorable record for the State. Therefore, if additional funds are made available to increase the investigative staff to conduct additional on-the-spot audits and other similar approaches to detect 1.2% of the cases, the money certainly will be spent. This preoccupation to detect the few who will "cheat" in any program has prevented the states from diverting funds presently used for investigation to rehabilitation programs. This latest survey conducted by the Federal Government at the request of the appropriations committee proved to be very expensive and there is no evidence that all the investigations conducted help people to become self supporting. A rehabilitation program which would necessitate fewer cases per worker and the establishment of a good relationship between the client and the worker will almost eliminate entirely the existing abuses in the program, and in the process will help people in need.

TABLE VIII

Percent of families receiving assistance who were eligible for assistance
 but receiving payments above or below the correct amount, by state
 AFDC Eligibility Review 1963 ¹⁵ (Sample)

State	Percent of Total AFDC Caseload	
	Eligible families receiving assistance above the correct amount (over Payment)	Eligible families receiving assistance below the correct amount (under payment)
Alabama	42.4	20.2
Arizona	9.9	10.3
Arkansas	11.5	10.5
California	7.9	11.0
Colorado	11.1	21.7
Connecticut	26.3	20.0
Delaware	3.6	5.8
Florida	7.0	4.2
Georgia	8.7	6.0
Idaho	8.8	5.1
Illinois	27.7	30.2
Iowa	12.2	10.2
Kansas	11.0	59.3
Kentucky	21.9	25.5
Louisiana	15.9	15.0
Maryland	11.5	26.9
Massachusetts	26.3	26.0
Michigan	2.6	.8
Minnesota	18.1	12.8
Mississippi	26.4	17.8
Missouri	6.1	6.5
Montana	4.5	2.7
Nebraska	8.0	5.6
<u>New Jersey</u>	12.5	19.8
New Mexico	11.1	14.8
New York	17.4	23.1
North Carolina	20.0	60.6
North Dakota	9.6	15.7
Ohio	28.1	42.8
Oklahoma	17.2	8.6
Pennsylvania	7.5	6.2
South Carolina	10.3	2.8
South Dakota	17.8	11.1
Tennessee	5.7	2.5
Texas	12.0	7.3

In closing we want to stress the fact that the people in Marin County, California
are not different from the people of any county in New Jersey. They are motivated
by the same desires, and they contribute to the people of this state. They have supported
as the people of this state will support, public assistance when they know that it is
reasonable, and they have not been able to do so. They will support
it when they know that the program is efficient and that it is administered. It is not
they will support it when they know that the program is adequately meeting the needs of
the citizens of the State of New Jersey.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Union League of Essex County is drawn to the many deficiencies of the public assistance program. However, we agree that it may be that the only program that prevents thousands of needy citizens who cannot make the adjustment to the new order of the economy from falling into the unemployment problem created by automation and related factors.

The Union League of Essex County believes that the State of New Jersey should implement the provisions specified in Title IV Section 407 of the Social Security Act, which extends the definition of the Aid to Dependent Children Program to include the training of individuals who are unable to obtain employment. We believe that the State of New Jersey is responsible for the administration of vocational education programs in the state with the intent of retraining individuals capable of being retrained.

The Union League of Essex County believes that the Aid to Dependent Children Program is a social service. We do not believe that the program should be administered on a punitive basis. It is a social service and it should be financed by the federal government. We therefore urge the State of New Jersey to amend the program in the public welfare law to state to all public assistance programs the provision that eliminated residence requirements from the Aid to Dependent Children Program.

The Union League of Essex County strongly recommends that the State of New Jersey abandon the punitive investigation approach in the administration of the public assistance program in favor of a social service approach. We feel that the punitive approach has never led to the rehabilitation of a single family nor has it decreased dependency. We believe that the introduction of social work services will help to rehabilitate families where this is possible and ultimately decrease the cost of the program.

The Union League of Essex County urges the State of New Jersey to introduce an effective in-service training course, improve working conditions and establish a revised state-wide salary scale to increase the effectiveness of the staff, increase morale and thereby increase the efficiency of the program.

The Union League of Essex County believes that it has been firmly established by federal, state and private investigation groups that recipients who deliberately attempt to perpetuate fraud in the Aid to Dependent Children Program comprise a very small percentage of the entire ADC caseload. In New Jersey this amounts to 1.2%. We urge the State of New Jersey to appropriate sufficient funds to administer a sound rehabilitative program. We believe that this approach is not only morally desirable but also fiscally sound.

NOTES

1. State of New Jersey, The New Jersey Employment and Labor Market (August 1963) No. 176, p. 1.
2. *Ibid.*, p.2.
3. *Ibid.*, p.10
4. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Bulletin (November 1960) pp 54-56. The information for the construction of this table was gathered from five tables appearing in this issue.
5. U.S. Government, Compilation of the Social Security Laws (December 31, 1962) pp 141-142
6. The Welfare Investigating Committee of the State of New Jersey Legislature, Legislative Report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey (January 1963) p 58.
7. Welfare Investigating Committee, op cit., p. 63.
8. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population, 1960 p. 4.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
10. Welfare Investigating Committee, op. cit., p. 79
11. Bell, Winifred, Hearings Before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives
12. Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, ADC: Facts, Fallacies, Future. (1962) p. 30.
13. Bell, op. cit., 375
14. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Eligibility of Families Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (July 1963) p. viii.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 19

REFERENCES CONSULTED

- National Association of Social Workers, Metropolitan Washington Chapter and The Commission on Human Resources. The Public Welfare Crisis in the Nation's Capital. Washington: 1963
- State of New Jersey, Department of Labor and Industry. The New Jersey Employment and Labor Market. No. 178, August 1963.
- State of New Jersey Legislature, The Welfare Investigating Committee, Legislative Report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey. Trenton: January 1963.
- State of New York, Moreland Commission Report on Welfare. New York: January 15, 1963.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Social Security Bulletin. Washington Government Printing Office, November 1960
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Eligibility of Families Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Washington: July 1963.
- U.S. Government, Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, Hearings Before the Committee on Ways and Means House of Representatives. Winifred Bell, The Practical Value of Social Work Service. Government Printing Office, February 1962.
- U.S. Government. Compilation of the Social Security Laws. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.
- Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, ADC: Facts, Fallacies, Future. Chicago: Greenleigh Associates, 1962.

OFFICERS

SIDNEY REITMAN	PRESIDENT
RICHARD D. MARSHALL	FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
MATTHEW L. KISELIK	SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
DONALD E. KING	SECRETARY
MRS. WILLIAM J. MALONE	TREASURER
MRS. HENRY A. DAVIDSON	TRUSTEE
L. HAMILTON GARNER	TRUSTEE
JERROLD STERN	TRUSTEE

EXECUTIVE BOARD

HAROLD A. LETT Honorary Life Member	JULIUS LEVY, M.D. Honorary Life Member
HARRY ANDERSON	HOWARD MASON
GORDON BASS	VICTOR PARSONNET
HERBERT BERGEN	DR. EARL B. PATTERSON
H. M. BOARDMAN	PHELPS PHELPS
MRS. TINA E. BOHANNON	MRS. LEONARD D. SAVOY
JOHN CERVASE	JACK SCHLESINGER
DR. THEODORE L. DULANY	REV. JAMES SCOTT
LEO C. FIELDS	MARTIN STUART
DR. PHILLIP E. GEAR	HERBERT TATE
MRS. KERMIT GOODE	REV. EDGAR THOMAS
MRS. WILLIAM H. HAYLING	MRS. MAX WIENER
ALFRED LOWENTHAL	

STAFF

JAMES A. PAWLEY	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RAYMOND MURPHY	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
FRED BARBARO	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
WILLIAM BLAKELY, JR.	DIRECTOR, SKILLS BANK
MRS. AGNES K. PARKER	ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
MRS. CHARLIE MAE COX	PLACEMENT CLERK
MISS DORIS STROBRIDGE	CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
MRS. JUNE CHILDS	CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
MISS EUNICE MORTON	ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY 58 JONES STREET, NEWARK, N. J.

Affiliated with the National Urban League
Member of Welfare Federation of Newark
A Red Feather Agency

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY

A SOCIAL WORK AGENCY FOR INTER-RACIAL
COOPERATION

MEMBER WELFARE FEDERATION OF NEWARK

58 JONES STREET
NEWARK 3, N. J.



NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID

Newark, N. J.
Permit No. 3706

Miriam V. Studley
P.O. Box 630
Newark, New Jersey